



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The nations shall learn war no more.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PEACE BETWEEN
INDIVIDUALS, CLASSES AND NATIONS.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.
SINGLE NUMBERS, TEN CENTS.

Address all communications to

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Mail Matter.

GREAT BRITAIN AND VENEZUELA.

Action of the International Arbitration and Peace Association.

This Association, whose headquarters are at 40 Outer Temple, Strand, London, passed the following resolution in reference to the Venezuela trouble on Saturday, the 21st of December. We also subjoin a statement, sent us by the Secretary, of the various attempts made by the Association to induce the British Foreign Office to submit the whole question to arbitration. These attempts have been fruitless, but they have been highly commendable. If all the friends of peace throughout Great Britain had been as faithful, what a world of trouble and anxiety might have been saved on both sides of the Atlantic!

RESOLUTION.

"That the long-standing boundary dispute with Venezuela having resulted in a grave crisis between this country and the United States, this Committee, having repeatedly urged in accordance with its principles that the aforesaid dispute should be submitted to arbitration, while regretting the attitude assumed in President Cleveland's Message to the United States Congress and not recognizing the right of the United States Government to decide the question, re-asserts its position, and once more expresses the hope that the whole subject matter of the dispute may even now be referred to independent and impartial arbitration."

STATEMENT.

In December, 1892, the Committee wrote to the Foreign Office stating that, from information it had received, the new government in Venezuela, under President Crespo, would probably be favorably inclined to any proposal likely to bring about a renewal of good relations between the two governments, and that if no agreement could be arrived at recourse should be had to arbitration. The Foreign Office replied that the government of Venezuela was fully aware of the terms on which her Majesty's Government would renew diplomatic relations.

In the autumn of 1893, the Committee endeavored to arrange a conference between Dr. Michelena (the special envoy from the Venezuelan Government) and some British members of Parliament, but Dr. Michelena consider-

ing that he had better see only official representatives of the government, this proposal fell through.

In November, 1893, the Committee again wrote to the Foreign Office pointing out the disadvantages of the then existing state of affairs, and urged that practical efforts should be made towards a settlement.

The Foreign Office replied that some of the claims of the Venezuelan Government were "so unfounded in fact, and so unfair to the colony of British Guiana, as not to be properly a subject for arbitration."

In February, 1894, application was made to the Foreign Office as to what these "unfounded and unfair" claims were. The Foreign Office replied that there was nothing to be added to its former reply.

In June, 1894, on the occasion of the announcement of hostile resolutions to be submitted to the Venezuelan Senate as to trade with England and the suspension of the payment of interest on the English debt, the Committee wrote to the Foreign Office submitting that England ought not to be judge in her own cause, and again urging arbitration.

This was duly acknowledged by the Foreign Office.

In December, 1894, on the occasion of President Cleveland's Message to Congress in which he stated that he had urged arbitration on Great Britain, the Committee wrote to the Foreign Office suggesting the renewal of diplomatic relations, as a first step towards an amicable settlement, and asking for full and specific information.

This having been acknowledged, the Committee, in February, 1895, again wrote to the Foreign Office asking to be favored with fuller and more definite information, but this was refused. In April 1, 1895, Mr. W. P. Byles (then member for the Shipley Division of Yorkshire) put a question in the House of Commons, on behalf of the Association, but no fresh information was given by Sir E. Grey (then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs) in reply.

Finally, in October last the Committee again drew the attention of the Foreign Office to the importance of some amicable settlement of the question being arrived at, which letter was duly acknowledged.

THE DOCTRINE OF NON-INTERFERENCE.

BY JEROME DOWD,

Professor of Political Economy and Social Science, Trinity College, N. C.

The recent rebellion in Cuba, the massacres in Armenia, and the dispute over the boundary line of Venezuela, have aroused the public mind in all civilized countries upon the subject of international law and morals, and brought to the minds of the people the question as to what extent and under what circumstances is one nation justified in interfering with the affairs of another over which it has no political control?

Until recent years nations were more inclined to interfere than to adopt the negative policy. This is especially true of Great Britain, where the growth of the non-intervention principle has been very slow, the first assertion of it having been made by Mr. Canning in 1826.

However, in latter days, the engines of death are so terrible, that nations are extremely cautious about interfering with the affairs of each other. The proba-

bility is that the nations of the earth will, in the future, incline too much toward the non-interference policy. But, in the opinion of the writer, the doctrine of non-interference must give way if civilization is to make any notable advance. With the development of international trade, the communities of the world become more and more dependent on each other and the necessity for uninterrupted intercourse becomes more and more urgent. The study of sociology in the past few years is having a great effect in changing the ideas of people as to the rights of individuals and nations. The desire for absolute independence, which still widely prevails, is the natural outcome of the primitive conditions of production. But as society develops the actions of men become wider in extent and each one's liberty becomes circumscribed by the rights of every one else. A conviction of this fact is finding lodgment in the public mind, and when the people of China and Japan desert their fields and shops to engage in the business of killing each other, they destroy the market for thousands and millions of dollars worth of goods produced in America upon the basis of exchange with those countries. People no longer feel that a war in China is no body's business on this side of the globe. It is just as important, from an international point of view, for China and Japan to remain at their posts of duty supplying the world with the goods, which the world has a right to expect, as it is important, from a local point of view, for the coal diggers of Pennsylvania to supply fuel for the furnaces of New England. However, the economic view furnishes the least justification for interference. There are great moral reasons which more strongly urge that course.

Responsibility accompanies the power of a nation as it accompanies the development of the individual. Every one is, in a sense, his neighbor's keeper and none of the moral obligations of man to man are abridged by the boundary lines of states. The great apostle Paul says, "I am debtor both to the Greeks and the Barbarians, both to the wise and the unwise."

The massacres in Armenia or any other acts of gross inhumanity justify and demand interference on the part of outside nations. Indeed, it is difficult to see how civilized and Christianized people can escape the responsibility for such deeds. Hugo says, as between a man who does a monstrous deed and one who allows it to be done, "the one who allows it to be done is the worst, because he is a coward!"

There is the same moral reason for interfering to prevent two nations from fighting as there is for interfering to prevent two individuals from fighting. The day is not far distant when nations that stand off and permit war between other nations will be looked upon with as much contempt as is now visited upon individuals who stand by with folded arms while two of their fellow-men are attempting to kill each other.

The greatest obstacle to interference in such cases is the fact that each State, at present, decides for itself when, and to what extent, it shall meddle with the affairs of another country. This is as chaotic a condition of things as if each individual of society were left to decide when to interfere to quell a disturbance or to right a wrong. The civilized nations should call a convention and adopt some international police regulations and provide for arbitration or judicial settlement of all interstate disputes. With the advance of civilization the question of international arbitration becomes more and more vital and pressing.

DURHAM, N. C., January, 1896.

THE "INVIGORATING INFLUENCE OF WAR."

BY REV. S. C. BUSHNELL.

On the fourteenth page of Adolf Erman's "Life in Ancient Egypt,"—one of the finest works on Egypt and standing almost alone in a class by itself,—we find a sentiment against which we must vigorously protest.

"The undisturbed repose in which life in Egypt developed was in many respects happy for the nation; yet there is the reverse side to the picture. The Egyptians were the least warlike of all the nations of the ancient East. Their contests with the Beduins can scarcely be called warfare, and the internal struggles were always of a subordinate character, owing to the curious long form of the country. The Egyptians therefore had no heroes of war whom they could celebrate in song; their heroes like those of the Chinese, were wise kings and princes of old time; they never experienced the invigorating influence of a great national war."

Unhappy Egyptians, with no one to slaughter! Or, as it is the fate of those who wield the sword sooner or later to feel its edge, unhappy Egyptians who flourished for two thousand years without experiencing this "invigorating influence!" Egypt was hoary with antiquity when Abraham appeared upon the scene. The pyramids and sphynx had been standing for hundreds of years when he first looked upon them. They date from the fourth dynasty while the career of Moses belongs to the nineteenth.

War did not begin its "invigorating influence" until the time of Thothmes III. and Rameses II. Then Thebes reached its highest glory. But two can play at the game of war, and the loser never feels invigorated by defeat, as Egypt found out to her sorrow again and again. Imperfect as our knowledge is concerning those first two thousand years of peace they represent a civilization which has been the wonder of the world. If they produced no other heroes than "wise kings" and unwarlike "princes" who levied no military taxes, nor sent their subjects to be mown down by the chariots of the enemy they bequeathed to their successors a prosperity far too valuable to be exposed to the risks of war.